Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

RCE and Extension of Time

Requests for continued examination (RCE) and a three month extension of time are enclosed in response to the final Office Action mailed on October 29, 2010, and Advisory Action mailed on March 3, 2011. The extended period for response expires on April 29, 2011.

Claim Status

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 are amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1 and 6

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Fyfe (US 5,428,666). In response, applicant traverses the rejections.

Fyfe discloses that RAM 30 of mobile radio-telephone 10 includes a plurality of number assignment modules (NAMs) 32. Telephone 10 seeks to match system identification data in received control signals with system identification data stored in NAMs 32, and uses the NAM containing the matched system identification data for communication (Abstract). Each NAM 32 includes first field 34 storing a mobile telephone identification number (MIN), second field 36 storing a system identification code (SID_p), and third field 38 storing a system type (col. 4, lines 13-19). RAM 30 also includes a field 38 storing a NAM priority directory cross-referencing each NAM with a priority ranking and identifying the NAM 32 to be used during roaming (col. 4, lines 36-41). In particular, the NAM priority directory includes first fields 42 storing NAM identification codes (NAM IDs), second fields 44 storing an assigned priority associated with each NAM ID, and third fields 46 storing a roaming identification associated with each NAM ID (col. 4, lines 42-54).

The final Action asserts that Fyfe's NAMs correspond to applicant's claimed "plurality of communication interfaces". Further, the Advisory Action asserts that the NAM IDs stored in the NAM priority directory correspond to applicant's claimed "communication interface identification address for identifying the selected communication interface". For the reasons set forth in applicant's response to the final Action, applicant maintains that Fyfe's NAMs do not correspond to the claimed communication interfaces, and does not agree that the NAM IDs correspond to the claimed communication interface identification address. Nevertheless, in order to even more clearly distinguish the present invention from Fyfe, claims 1 and 6 are amended to clarify that the terminal identification and communication interface identification addresses themselves are transmitted via the selected communication interface. Claim 1, for example, is amended to recite:

> ...a transmitting section which transmits the data and the two kinds of addresses assigned to the data via the selected communication interface...

Claim 6 is amended in the same fashion. As described, for example, in paragraph 0039 of applicant's published application (US 2007/0225032), the two kinds of addresses (the terminal identification address and the communication interface identification address) are actually transmitted from mobile communication terminal 100 to mobile communication managing apparatus 200. In Fyfe, by contrast, telephone 10 seeks to match system identification data in incoming control signals with system identification data stored in NAMs 32, and there is no disclosure or suggestion that the NAM IDs are transmitted outside of telephone 10.

Further, applicant's terminal identification address (which is transmitted via the selected communication interface) is unique to the mobile communication terminal. See, for example, paragraphs 0039 and 0048 of applicant's published application. In order to emphasize this feature, claims 1 and 6 are amended to recite that:

> ...the terminal identification address is unique to the mobile communication terminal...

By contrast, although Fyfe states that each NAM includes a "unique" mobile telephone identification number (MIN) (col. 4, lines 14-16), Fyfe explains that each MIN is stored in association with a system identification code (SID) of a cellular system (col. 1, lines 36-50), and that one mobile unit may have a different phone number on each of many different cellular systems (col. 2, lines 38-46). Thus, the MINs stored in Fyfe's NAMs are unique to a particular system (SID) and are not unique to the mobile communication terminal. In other words, Fyfe's mobile unit 10 may have many different MINs stored therein, and not a MIN that is unique to mobile unit 10, as is required for any correspondence to applicant's claims.

Accordingly, since Fyfe does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1 and 6, Fyfe does not anticipate claims 1 and 6, and their rejections under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 7

Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Raviv (US 2002/0164983). In response, applicant traverses the rejections.

Raviv discloses an interfacing apparatus for supporting cellular data communication to roaming mobile telephony devices (Abstract). As described in Raviv's FIG. 8 and paragraph 0290, for example, a data request for a data service is received from a mobile device in step 800. The data request is analyzed in step 810 and a service profile of the requesting device is identified in step 820. The service profile is used to select a service network corresponding to the required data service in step 830 and, in step 840, the mobile device is introduced to the selected network.

As understood by applicant, the Examiner considers Raviv's plurality of service networks from which a service network is selected as corresponding to the claimed "plurality of communication interfaces". However, applicant's communication interfaces are distinguishable from the service networks of Raviv in that applicant's communication interfaces may be for different communication methods, such as communication by a mobile telephone network or communication by a wireless LAN. See, for example, paragraphs 0037 and 0038 of applicant's published application. Claims 3 and 7 are amended as follows to emphasize this distinguishing feature:

> ...a mobile communication terminal having a plurality of communication interfaces <u>for different communication methods</u>...

Raviv, by contrast, does not disclose or suggest that the service networks from which a service network is selected are for different communication methods.

Accordingly, since Raviv does not disclose each and every feature of claims 3 and 7, Raviv does not anticipate claims 3 and 7, and their rejections under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Fyfe in view of Matsugatani (US 2002/0080778). Claims 4, 8 and 9 are rejected as obvious over Fyfe in view of Raviv. Claim 5 is rejected as obvious over Fyfe in view of Raviv, Matsugatani and Urabe (US 6,125,282). In response, applicant traverses the rejections.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and distinguishes over Fyfe for the same reasons as claim 1. In this regard, Matsugatani, which is cited for its relevant to a switch information signal that is transmitted when certain conditions are met, does not remedy the deficiencies of Fyfe with respect to claim 1.

Independent claims 4 and 8 are amended in the same fashion as discussed above for claims 1 and 6. That is, claims 4 and 8 now recite that the terminal identification and communication interface identification addresses themselves are transmitted via the selected communication interface, and that the terminal identification address is unique to the mobile communication terminal. Thus, claims 4 and 8 distinguish over Fyfe and Raviv for at least these reasons. Further, claim 4 is also amended in the same fashion as claims 3 and 7, that is, to recite that the mobile communication terminal has a plurality of communication interfaces for different communication methods. Thus, claim 4 distinguishes over Fyfe and Raviv for this reason as well.

Claims 5 and 9 depend respectively from claims 4 and 8 and are allowable for the same reasons. In this regard, Urabe, which is cited for its relevance to a switching information signal assigned with terminal and communication interface identification addresses corresponding to a new communication interface, do not remedy the deficiencies of Fyfe and Raviv with respect to base claims 4 and 8.

For these reasons, the rejections of claims 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after consideration and entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,
DLA PIPER LLP (US)

Date: April 28, 2011

By: _____
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: 310-595-3000
Facsimile: 310-595-3400